



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

Sc

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,359	12/01/2000	David Helm	CM04662H	4118
22917	7590	04/05/2004	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA, INC. 1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD IL01/3RD SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			MEHRA, INDER P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2666	13
DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/728,359	HELM ET AL.
	Examiner Inder P Mehra	Art Unit 2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-6,9-12 and 14-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-6,9-12 and 14-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)           | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                   |

***Response to Amendment***

1. This is in response to an Amendment C dated 6/24/03 after RCE, which has been fully considered and made of record. Based on this amendment, claims 1, 7, 8 and 13 were cancelled previously, claims 2 (amended twice), 3 (amended twice), 4 (amended once), 5 (amended (once), 6 (amended twice), 9 (amended twice), 10 (amended twice), 11(amended once), 12 (amended twice), 14 (amended twice), 15 (amended twice), 16 (amended once), 17 (amended twice), 18 (amended once), 19 (amended once), 21 (amended once), and 22 (amended twice). claims 2-6, 9-12, and 14-24 are now pending. In view of the following explanation , this office action is Final.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2, 6, 9, 12, 15-16 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Haggerty et al** (US Patent No. 6,331,983), hereinafter Haggerty in view of **Cotton et al** (4,740,954), hereinafter Cotton..

Regarding claims 2, 12, 15-16 and 22, Haggerty discloses, in reference to fig. 5, multi-cast communication involving multi-cast switches; a method comprising:

*Response to Amendment*

1. This is in response to an amendment (Response) dated 6/24/03, which has been fully considered and made of record. Based on this amendment, claims 1, 7, 8 and 13 were cancelled previously, claims 2 (amended thrice), 3 (amended twice), 4 (amended once), 5 (amended (once), 6 (amended twice), 9 (amended twice), 10 (amended twice), 11(amended once), 12 (amended twice), 14 (amended twice), 15 (amended thrice), 16 (amended once), 17 (amended twice), 18 (amended once), 19 (amended once), 21 (amended once), and 22 (amended thrice). claims 2-6, 9-12, and 14-24 are now pending. In view of the following explanation , this office action is Non-Final.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2, 6, 9, 12, 15-16 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Haggerty et al** (US Patent No. 6,331,983), hereinafter Haggerty in view of **Cotton et al** (4,740,954), hereinafter Cotton, further in view of **Brachman et al** (US Patent No. 6,704,576), hereinafter, Brachman.

Regarding claims 2, 12, 15-16 and 22, Haggerty discloses, in reference to fig. 5, multi-cast communication involving multi-cast switches; a method comprising:

- announce information to other switches---for connection set up (sending or receiving indicia, as recited in claim 2, from a sending host packets addressed to a multicast group), refer to col. 17 lines 17-22,col. 18 lines 24-26, and col. 32 lines 19-21;
- IGMP state machine to facilitate hosts join multicast group and reliable delivery setting a timer to ensure reliably join the multicast group (issuing a join command to join the multicast group address) refer to col. 17 lines 22-24 and 39-42;
- reliable delivery setting a timer to ensure reliably join the multicast group (determining whether any packets are received), refer to col. 17 lines 22-24 and 39-42;
- if a timer expires without any reports (to ensure reliably joined or not information in the table), there are no receivers for that group (if packets are received by the receiving host within the designated time period, determining that the receiving host is joined to the multicast group), refer to col. 19 lines 29-51;
- whereby the method is independent of the multicast network, refer to “Haggerty discloses explicitly, ‘Protocol independent Multicast-Dense Mode’, refer to col. 15 line 3; ‘independent of spanning tree used for the multicast’, refer to col. 14 lines 59-61. Further, Fig. 1 used by Haggerty is for example only, refer to col. 10 lines 40-43.

Haggerty does not disclose expressly if any packets are received within designated time period, determining that the receiving host is reliably joined to the multi-cast group address;

Cotton discloses host sending packets to the multicast address in time interval, smaller than max time, to insure joining the group and table is not cleared (determining whether any packets are received within a designated time period----); further discloses, "if joined after the designated time interval, it is not accepted and relevant entries in the table cleared" (if packets are not received ----within the designated time period, determined that the first host is not joined ---to the group), refer to col. 3 lines 10-27.

Cotton discloses the use of devices illustratively and numerous alternative embodiments may be devised by those skilled in the art, refer to col. 5 lines 10-15.

Brachman et al (US Patent No. 6,704,576) discloses explicitly, " users may receive content that is specifically tailored to the user's interests, refer to col. 11 lines 14-15.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Brachman's system and Cotton's multicast routing algorithm into Haggerty's multi-cast switching system in order to ensure the receiver having reliably joined within specified time or leave with IGMP message. The suggestion/ motivation to do so would have been logical to have timer set to a value no less than the IGMP interval and monitor the arrival before the expiry of timer. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art that the use of timer is an efficient and guaranteed technique to ensure the reliable join by receivers and use IGMP Leave message to leave multi-cast group.

Regarding claims 6 and 21, Haggerty discloses the method of claim 1, comprising:

- message sent to all routers group address in multi-cast router network communication (sending/receiving messages----- the multi-cast group address), refer to col. 18 lines 21-36;

Regarding claim 9, Haggerty discloses, in reference to fig. 10, host can join a multi-cast group through IGMP protocol or reports (sending an IGMP join message to one or more network devices), refer to col. 14 lines 28-30, col. 17 lines 22-23 and col. 18 lines 51-52.

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Haggerty discloses, routers (gateways), refer to col. 17, line 24, internetwork 117 in fig. 1, mobile sender, refer to col. 20 line 50 (sourcing host ---selected from the group consisting of----wireless communication device);

4. Claims 3-5, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Haggerty et al** (US Patent No. 6,331,983), hereinafter Haggerty in view of **Cotton et al** (US Patent No. 4,740,954), hereinafter Cotton and **Brachman et al** (US Patent No. 6,704,576), hereinafter, Brachman, and further in view of **Donahue et al** (US Patent No. 6,266,339), hereinafter Donahue.

Regarding claims 3-5 and 17- 20, Haggerty discloses video data in packet (video payload), refer to col. 10 lines 56-67;

Haggerty, Cotton and Brachman do not disclose test packets and payload; audio payload, multimedia payload, and multiple test packets before sending payload;

Donahue discloses audio video multi-cast channel payload, col. 11 line 56 and col. 14 lines 48-51; and data payload of the multi-cast including IP address and test pattern (packets comprise sending multiple test packets before sending payload);

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Brachman's system, Donahue's high bandwidth broadcasting system and Cotton's multicast routing algorithm into Haggerty's multi-cast switching system in order to have packets include audio/video payload and test packets. The suggestion/ motivation to do so would have been logical to have integrated data system. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art that the use of audio/video data transmission system is capable of multi-casting to large number of receivers.

5. Claims 10, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Haggerty et al** (US Patent No. 6,331,983), hereinafter Haggerty in view of **Cotton et al** (US Patent No. 4,740,954), hereinafter Cotton and **Brachman et al** (US Patent No. 6,704,576), hereinafter, Brachman, and further in view of **Adelman et al** (US Patent No. 6,006,259), hereinafter Adelman.

Regarding claims 10, 11 and 14, Haggerty discloses the method of claim 2 further comprising:

- announcement signal on leaving a group (issuing a leave command) to the one or more network devices, refer to col. 21 lines 37-38;
- IGMP state machine to facilitate hosts join multicast group and reliable delivery setting a timer to ensure reliably join the multicast group (re-attempting to join the multicast group address) refer to col. 17 lines 22-24 and 39-42;

Art Unit: 2666

- reliable delivery setting a timer to ensure reliably join the multicast group (determining whether any packets are received by the receiving host within a designated time period), col. 17 lines 22-24 and 39-42;
- if a timer expires without any reports, there are no receivers for that group (if packets are not received by the receiving host within the designated time period, determining that the receiving host is not reliably joined to the multicast group), refer to col. 19 lines 29-51;

Haggerty, further discloses IGMP leave message, recited in claim 11, for leaving multi-cast group; refer to col. 21 lines 35-38; and announces to all switches (sending an IGMP leave message to one or more local network devices), refer to col. 21 lines 35-38;

Cotton discloses host sending packets to the multicast address in time interval, smaller than max time to insure joining the group and table is not cleared (determining whether any packets are received within a designated time period----); further discloses, “if joined after the designated time interval, it is not accepted and relevant entries in the table cleared” (if packets are not received ----within the designated time period, determined that the first host is not joined ---to the group), refer to col. 3 lines 10-27.

Haggerty, Cotton and Brachman do not disclose expressly re-attempting to join the multi-cast group address, even though Haggerty discloses hosts want to join multicast groups, refer to col. 17 lines 39-42;

Adelman discloses cluster member/cluster client will try to join the cluster **again** (re-attempting to reliably join the multi-cast group address;

Art Unit: 2666

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Adelman's network clustering system and Brachman's system, Cotton's system into Haggerty's multi-cast switching system in order to ensure the receiver having reliably joined within specified time or leave with IGMP message. The suggestion/ motivation to do so would have been logical to have timer set to a value no less than the IGMP interval and monitor the arrival before the expiry of timer. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art that the use of timer is an efficient and guaranteed technique to ensure the reliable join by receivers and use IGMP Leave message to leave multi-cast group.

*Response to Arguments*

6. Applicant's arguments filed 2/10/04, in regard to claims 2-6,9-12, and 14-24 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues , "Applicants' have added a limitation to independent claims 2, 15, and 22 so that Applicants', claimed invention is "independent of the multicast network." Further, Applicants' argue that support for the new limitation is found is found in Applicants' specification.

In response, it is stated that this limitation is not supported by specification. Pages of specification, as specified by the Applicants', describe the devices used in fig. I. Therefore, once the network is selected, the devices will be used accordingly. The use of devices will be tailored according to user's requirements.

However, Haggerty discloses explicitly, "Protocol independent Multicast-Dense Mode", refer to col. 15 line 3; "independent of spanning tree used for the multicast", refer to col. 14 lines 59-61. Further, Fig. 1 used by Haggerty is for example only, refer to col. 10 lines 40-43.

Art Unit: 2666

Cotton discloses the use of devices illustratively and numerous alternative embodiments may be devised by those skilled in the art, refer to col. 5 lines 10-15.

Brachman et al (US Patent No. 6,704,576) discloses explicitly, "users may receive content that is specifically tailored to the user's interests, refer to col. 11 lines 14-15.

*In the light of above explanation, the arguments by applicant are not persuasive.*

7. Any enquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Inder Mehra whose telephone number is (703)305-1985. The examiner can be normally reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao, can be reached on (703)308-5463.

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. or faxed to: (703)872-9314

For informal or draft communications, please, label "Proposed" or "Draft".

Hand delivered responses should be brought to: Receptionist (Sixth Floor), Crystal Park  
2, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, VA.

Inder Mehra  
Inder Mehra 3/30/04  
March 30, 2004

DANG TON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER